

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. STEINKE.005A 6810 Tom Steinke 12/13/2001 10/017,341 EXAMINER 7590 09/24/2004 20995 THALER, MICHAEL H KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER FOURTEENTH FLOOR 3731 IRVINE, CA 92614 DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>T</i>
		10/017,341	STEINKE, TOM	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	•
		Michael Thaler	3731	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	aaress
riod fo	or Reply		MONTH(S) FROM	
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rough or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may eply within the statutory minimum of the dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) May have the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered time ONTHS from the mailing date of this ARANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.
tatus		•	÷,	ŕ
. = 7	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29	June 2004.		
1)⊠	This action is FINAL 2b) \ T	his action is non-final.		
2a)∐	Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal man	atters, prosecution as to th	e merits is
3)[_]	closed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
)ienoeit	ion of Claims	•		
		on.		
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application. Ia) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-6,8 and 9</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
		WIGHT HOLL COLORGIA		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	`		
	Claim(s) 7 and 10-14 is/are rejected.	•		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	dler alastian requirement		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	a/or election requirement.		
• -	tion Papers			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	A Double - Francisco	
10)	l The drawing(s) filed onis/are:_a)□ :	accepted or b)∐ objected	to by the Examiner.	
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.00(a)	
	Bankagement drawing sheet(s) including the col	rection is required if the draw	ring(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(u).
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attac	hed Office Action or form	P [O-152.
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
	1 Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.		
	2 ☐ Certified conies of the priority docum	nents have been received i	in Application No	
*	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have be	een received in this Natior	al Stage
	application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
	application from the international Bo See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies	not received.	
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a	31 32		
Attachm		4) 🗍 Interv	iew Summary (PTO-413)	
1) 🖂 No	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946	Paper	No(s)/Mail Date	DTO 152\
3) 🔯 Inf	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S	B/08) J L 14080	e of Informal Patent Application (F10-152)
Pa	aper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/20/02,9/9/02</u> .	6) Other	·•	

Art Unit: 3731

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on June 29, 2004.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ryan (5,830,217). Ryan discloses stent 1, expandable member 2 and a dissolvable polymer 12 which bonds the stent 1 and expandable member 2 together (col. 4, lines 40-66 and col. 6, lines 29-51, particularly lines 47-51). Ryan fails to

Art Unit: 3731

disclose the specific method of production of the product including the steps of dissolving the polymer in a solvent and allowing the solution to air cure. However, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (MPEP 2113). In this case, the product in the product-by-process claim 7 is certainly the same as or obvious from the Ryan product.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khosravi et al. (5,441,515) in view of Ryan (5,830,217). Khosravi et al. disclose a catheter having an expandable member (the balloon catheter described in col. 3, lines 17-37) coupled to an expansion actuator (the source of inflation fluid for the balloon catheter) and a stent (e.g. the stent shown in figure 26) comprising a tubular member comprising a series of locking radial elements (elements 380 and the elements between slots 395) and at least one articulating mechanism 385 that permits one-way sliding of the radial elements but prevents recoil from the expanded diameter (the abstract). Khosravi et al. fail to disclose a degradable polymeric coating that holds the stent on the expandable member.

Art Unit: 3731

However, Ryan teaches that a polymeric coating should be applied a stent and expandable member in order to obtain the advantage of keeping the stent securely attached to the catheter until deployment is desired (col. 2, lines 35-38 and col. 2, line 64 to col. 3, line 9). It would have been obvious to include a polymeric coating on the Khosravi et al. stent and expandable member so that it too would have this advantage. Note that Ryan discloses polyethylene glycol, for example, as the polymer (col. 6, lines 44-51). As to claim 11, note col. 8, lines 60-62 of Ryan. As to claims 13 and 14, Khosravi et al. fail to disclose radial elements that alternate between radial elements having one rib and radial elements having two ribs. However, it is old and well known in this art to provide such an arrangement in order to provide enhanced strength to the stent. It would have been obvious to this arrangement for the Khosravi et al. stent so that it too would have this advantage.

. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (703) 308-2981. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (703)308-2154. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 3731

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0858.

mht 9/16/04 MICHAEL THALER PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3731

Page 5

re